



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

them is—the rich flocks, the vines with their softly-globing bunches, the hurrying rivulets, the dove's voice in the elm, the murmur of the bees, the lengthening shadows, the rising moon upgathering her light in a white crucible, the smoke curling from happy hearths, the quiet night crowned with sleep, and again the early piping of the birds and the bright dew upon the morning grass. *O fortunatos!*—ye to whose faithful toil the earth yields its golden harvest. *Felix!*—you who know intimately the great Earth-Mother, and for whom fear and fate and the roar of hungry death are hidden by spring's glamor and summer's promise and autumn's fulfilment and the white peace of winter. Yea, *fortunatus ille!*—for the smoke from his pure hearth is incense to heaven; Pan and the kindly satyrs haunt his woods and meadows; and the shy and lovely sister-nymphs are misty forms before his sun-dazed eyes. Discord he knows not, nor corroding want. He tills the happy fields of his fathers and passes them on to his thrice-blessed children. Of such is the *gens togata*, the *rerum domini*—citizens, and yet world-rulers, whose type is Cincinnatus hastening from the plow to the dictator's chair.

The silver globe of Hesperus, the lengthening shadows, and a plaintive whine from Billy recall to me the time's passing. Upon the eastern edge of a yellow stubble field a yellow, ghostly moon hangs bubble-wise, poised so lightly between heaven and earth that a breath would seem to set it floating. The air shivers lightly through all its warmth. Noon readjusts itself with a view to becoming night, and night justifies its approach by a splendor-glowing west. Home beckons—old figure of speech, but home should rightly have no other gesture. Home beckons; and so, with Billy's head cuddling in my neck, and Vergil lying in state upon the pillow of the baby-carriage, we answer the gracious summons. I slip the Master back into his place upon the shelf, and in a softened mood I lift Cicero On Old Age from the floor, smooth his crumpled leaves, and give him to his niche. 'Old age hath yet his honor and his toil', aye, and his peace and pleasure too, if he have not grown too deaf of ear and heart to hear great Nature calling to him through the many-voiced lure of her fountains and groves and leaf-crowned hills, *Ducite ab urbe domum*

'Bring Daphnis home from the city, O my songs!
Bring Daphnis home!'

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS.

HELEN COALE CREW.

REVIEWS

The Katharsis of Homer

Studies in the Odyssey. By J. A. K. Thomson. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1914). Pp. xii + 250. 7s., 6d., net (\$2.50).

Mr. Thomson's book is an attempt to do for the Odyssey what Professor Murray thinks he has done for the Iliad—to prove its evolution through centuries

as a "traditional book" of the Greeks. Neither Professor Murray nor Mr. Thomson professes to be very hopeful of success. The former's "object all through is illustration rather than argument", and the latter only "seeks to illustrate a process". But in each case this confession of insufficiency is in strange contrast to the general tone of the discussion, which is as confident as if the thesis were being supported all along the line by irrefragable proof.

The generally accepted presumption in favor of unity of authorship based on harmony of tone and a symmetry of structure, *tanta* (in the words of Wolf) *quantam vix ullum aliud epos habet*, is summarily rejected by Mr. Thomson, as being only an "assumption" till it is shown that such consistency could not have arisen in some other manner. This is a pleasant way of imposing on Unitarians the burden of proving an impossibly huge negative, but Mr. Thomson does not really mean it. In fact we must understand him as accepting the onus of proving the affirmative, but in which part of his work the demonstration is to be found is not apparent. For he has written but little about the epic, though much about the saga and "the beastly devices of the heathen".

It is with these devices, "questions of mythology and religion", that he tells us he is mostly concerned, and these in an age so distant and dim that only "a few mystical and exceptional minds" can appreciate human thought and feeling in it. This is a plain *ἐκὰς ἔστε, βέβηλοι*, and a chapter on Antelucana is provided to help *nous autres* to think black for a time. As a "revelation", however, of "the depth of the background" of the Homeric poetry and of the extent of the "latent and unexpurgated magic and savagery. . . in that unexplored region", the chapter is a failure. A discussion of transformations in Homer and two quite feeble additions to Professor Murray's list of expurgations are far from impressive. And one remembers Dr. Farnell's cautions (the latest in Archiv für Religionswissenschaft for 1914, 17 ff.), as to the Harrisonian reading, in Themis and elsewhere, of the conditions which obtained in the earliest Greece we know. Mr. Thomson thinks the Odyssean tradition arose in still earlier days, but he can have no exact knowledge on the point.

The disquisitions on the saga and its developments contained in this book and Professor Murray's work, The Rise of the Greek Epic, have their own interest, especially for a certain mythologico-anthropological school, but they are not relevant to the main position. Homerists will demand evidence that the poems grew, and for this they are offered nothing of importance except a theory of expurgation. Our authors have persuaded themselves that there were formerly nasty, unpleasant things in the epic. They are not there now, or not there in their pristine force and abundance; therefore, they must have been purged away, and therefore there must have been expurgators, or an expurgatory Homeric spirit which required ages to operate in.

The inference of course is no small one, and it is a prime difficulty in the way of its acceptance that many horrors remained in the two epics (expurgation being, as Professor Murray lightly says, "baffled"), and remained also in other branches of Greek literature. This was at once pointed out by Andrew Lang, who, in various essays, made havoc of the new theory. The opinion has even been expressed that he demolished it. Mr. Thomson, however, thinks Professor Murray argued "persuasively"—he would surely have liked to say 'convincingly'—and even adds to his predecessor's instances of expurgation. To ascertain by examination in detail how far these provide a solid basis for the notion is the object of the present paper.

The first horror is the practice, *inter Christianos haud nominandum*, associated with Sodom and Gomorrah. "Homer has swept this whole business, root and branch, out of his conception of life"—which is merely strong language to compensate for want of evidence. The proof adduced is the "silence of Homer" about Ganymede in Iliad 5. 266 and 20. 231, which is begging the question, and Professor Murray's interpretation of *περ* in Iliad 24. 130. I find no support for his extortion of so much meaning from the particle. Apart from it, the argument amounts to this—the vice must have had its place in the poetry once upon a time; Professor Murray is sure it must. It is not there now (except as indicated by that telltale *περ*, which has somehow been overlooked): so it has been swept away by Homer or the Homeric spirit. Such reasoning leaves us entirely sceptical.

Next, in the Odyssey, we have the incestuous marriage of Alkinoos and Areté, brother and sister. The expurgator, offended by this, inserted a genealogy which, "in confused language", makes out that the pair were uncle and niece. But he not only bungled the matter; he also left in the poems the objectionable cases of Zeus and Hera, and of the sons and daughters of Aeolus. How he suffered these to stand betwixt the wind and his gentility, and only took exception to the irregularity among the remote Phaeacians, who are described as 'near to' the gods who practise this *incestum* among themselves, is not explained.

Cruel and barbarous practices were also banned by the progress of refinement. Thus, in the Iliad, Hector's corpse is dragged behind Achilles's chariot. This is so bad that Professor Murray says (the idea being as extravagant as it is novel), that "Achilles's repentance is the main theme of the last two books of the Iliad". Yet expurgation allowed it to stand! But the Homeric spirit was not inactive, for we are to believe that "a far worse story had really been handed down by the tradition", a story that Hector was dragged while still alive. The proof is to be found in the "rude unexpurgated saga" as vouched for by Sophocles (Ajax, 1031), Euripides (Androm. 399) and Vergil (Aen. 2. 273). On the basis of these most scanty references in literature, only the first of which is at all explicit, Professor Murray has the hardihood to

affirm that this version "on the whole dominated the tradition". "But Homer will have none of it". He must have known it. Why? Because Professor Murray requires such knowledge for his argument. The possibility that the more cruel version was a later development is quietly ignored.

It is said that there is no torture in the Iliad, but in one case "an older poet" had described "a particularly dreadful wound with, possibly, a certain gusto" (13. 567 ff.). This, we are to believe, was one of those pieces of brutality which the later softer Homeric spirit could not tolerate. Yet it was not expurgated away. There it still stands! Expurgation only inserted an "inorganic line", that is, one which "can be added or left out with no effect upon the grammar or continuity". One is accustomed to juggling with "inorganic lines" in Homeric criticism, but here one can only ask in amazement if Professor Murray has read the passage. The line (13. 573), which runs *ὅς ὁ τυπείσῃσπαιρε μίνυθᾶ περ, οὐ τι μάλα δῆν*, follows a simile and is followed by two lines from which it cannot possibly be disjoined. The line is as 'organic' as any in the Iliad. There is evidently some very sad mistake here.

The Odyssey, though a poem of peace, has more horrors than the Iliad. How they have been allowed to stand is not explained. The point is not settled, the question is only begged, by the remark that the Odyssey "is less rigorously cleaned up". The poem contains one notable scene of torture, that in which retribution overtakes the goatherd and the wanton maids. The latter are hung up by a rope. So far, Professor Murray "thinks", the older poet. Then comes what he calls the "saving line", in much the same terms as the one just quoted from the Iliad, and the conclusion is, "the torture of women was unpleasant even to an audience which approved the cruelty to the goatherd". What, then, has been expurgated? The horror is still there. Professor Murray evidently feels certain that the description was in worse terms in the earlier version. Of course he can know nothing about it. But worse than that is the absurdity of his asking us to believe that this description was modified in deference to a purer spirit, while the revolting details of the mutilation of the goatherd, which follow immediately on the above scene and are as horrible as anything in Homer, were left there in their naked barbarity.

Returning to the Iliad, Professor Murray gives us another case which, with superlative confidence, he describes as "equally clear". Custom allowed the Homeric warrior to take his slain foeman's armor. Then, if he wanted to "add a sting of outrage to the spoiling he tore the dead man's tunic and left him naked". This practice, for the existence of which Professor Murray follows Dr. Leaf, is based on Iliad 2. 416, 11. 100 and 16. 841, and the proof is so weak that he has recourse to the usual expedient—the practice has been "for the most part expurgated out of the

poem". In fact the practice is not established. Assuming it, however, Professor Murray applies it to Iliad 13. 439 f. There Idomeneus spears a man in the middle of his breast, *ῥῆξεν δὲ οἱ ἀμφὶ χιτῶνα χάλκεον, ὅς οἱ πρόσθεν ἀπὸ χροῦς ἦρκει δλεθρον*. The last line has been added, we are told, to get rid of one instance of a cruel practice—three references to which, be it observed, were allowed to remain in the poem—, and Professor Murray knows this from the fact that the added line converts the tunic into a tunic of bronze. The answer to that is not difficult, but I will not lengthen the discussion by going into it. It is sufficient to point out the remarkable situation which is the result of Professor Murray's excision. Idomeneus then spears his man and tears his tunic, and tears it off—of course stripping off the armour in order to get at it—while the victim still stands on his legs! For *δούπησεν δὲ πεσών* comes later (442). Nothing more need be said on this case.

Next comes the instance in Iliad 11. 99–100. Agamemnon has slain two Trojans. Then, *καὶ τοὺς μὲν λῖπεν αἰθῆ . . . στήθεισι παμφάλοντας, ἐπεὶ περιδύσε χιτῶνας*. Professor Murray says, "Agamemnon has slain some men", and adds, in his eagerness to prove his point, "and taken their armor". But there is not a word to this effect in the text. If that is to be argued, it must be argued on 99–100, but Professor Murray settles it before he comes to these lines. The lines themselves have been discussed by many authorities, the latest apparently Mr. Keene in *The Classical Review* 24. 84, and it is unnecessary to reproduce the points in the strife. That the chitons here are the bronze chitons or corselets is at least as likely as Professor Murray's view that Agamemnon (of all men!) is made by an expurgator "reverently" or "decently" to draw the dead men's tunics over them. It need only be added that for the debatable phrase there is a variant reading *ἐπεὶ κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἀπηύρα*, which Monro thinks "may well be the true reading" and which Leaf and Bayfield admit to the text. Professor Murray's discussion of the passage is remarkable for the calm assertion that the meaning of *περιδύω* in later Greek, which is inconvenient for his argument, was fixed by misinterpretation of the Homeric passage! Anything to make out a case.

There is one more instance from the battlefield, supplied to Professor Murray by Mr. Thomson. This is the decapitation of a slain enemy, and, as usual, the Professor's statement of the case supplies instances which, very strangely, have not been expurgated out of the poem. Now, in Iliad 18. 334 f., Achilles, addressing the dead Patroclus, says *οὐ σε πρὶν κτεριῶ, πρὶν γ' Ἐκτορος ἐνθάδ' ἐνείκαι τεύχεα καὶ κεφαλὴν*. Mr. Thomson "thinks that in the original story Achilles carried out his threat". For in Iliad 23. 24 ff. Achilles 'devised upon godlike Hector hideous deeds' and did—nothing. So Mr. Thomson "cannot get away from the impression that something objectionable has been left out". But first, he and Professor Murray

are wrong in taking *κεφαλὴ* in Iliad 18. 335 to mean 'head' only. The word is there used, as in other places, *de toto homine*. In Iliad 24. 276 and 579, for instance, the words *Ἐκτορέως κεφαλῆς* (the equivalent of *Ἐκτορος κεφαλῆ*) do not mean 'Hector's head'. But, better still, see Iliad 21. 336, where we have, as in our passage, *τεύχεα* and *κεφαλὴ* combined, and there, as Leaf says, "*κεφαλῆς* virtually = '*persons*'". Just so in our line in Iliad 18. But more. Has Mr. Thomson read the passage in Iliad 23? Achilles in line 21 assures Patroclus that Hector's corpse is to be given to the dogs to devour, and the poet, resuming from the speech, says in line 23, 'he spake and devised on Hector *δεῖκέα ἔργα*'¹. But Mr. Thomson must have something still more *δεικῆς* than giving the corpse as a feast to the dogs, and believes that, while that reference was left in, a simple decapitation was cut out. Tastes in such matters differ, of course, but surely in this case Mr. Thomson's has led him astray.

In his own book Mr. Thomson adds two cases to the list. In the Iliad, Dolon, going out as a spy by night, wraps a wolf's skin about his body. In the Rhesus, he converts himself into a wolf in external appearance, and in art he is shown as so disguised. So "one is bound to suppose", says Mr. Thomson, that this latter was part of the original tradition, and that Homer expurgates it as a grotesqueness very alien, "one feels at once", to the general tone of the Iliad. One is bound to suppose that the later version which might easily develop from Homer's simple wolf-skin, is the earlier, simply because Mr. Thomson wills it so.

This is obviously only an aesthetic expurgation. The other instance is of Professor Murray's genuinely ethical kind. It is "the absence in Homer of all apparent traces of that belief in the 'jealousy of the gods' (*φθόνος τῶν θεῶν*) which is something like a dogma for the rest of Greek literature". The Homeric spirit abhorred it, but it survived and was popular! But are there no traces in the epics of this grudging, on the part of the *θεοὶ ζήλημονες*, of earthly bliss or superiority? There is something very like it in Iliad 17. 448 ff. and Iliad 7. 451 ff., and there is the thing itself in Penelope's *θεοὶ δ' ὤπαζον ὀϊζύν, οἱ νῶϊν ἀγάσαντο κ. τ. λ.* (Odyssey 23. 210 ff.). The expurgator could not have overlooked that clear instance. But how are we to believe in an ethical agency that strained at the jealousy of the gods and swallowed all the other low elements of the divine nature as it appears in Homer? We know what Xenophanes thought of the heavenly morality, and the moderns have agreed with him. A recent authority describes Homer's picture of the celestial morals as a "most appalling conception", and expurgation must have been but a weak and wayward influence to wink at it.

¹Would Mr. Thomson find it impossible to get away from the impression that some grosser *μῦθος* has been expurgated away after, for instance, Iliad 1.326, *ὡς εἰπὼν προτεῖ, κρατερὸν δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλε*?

And so on. The catalogue of horrors which were expelled from the epic or left in it in such a haphazard way does not deserve more space. Professor Murray goes on to poisoned arrows and builds a theory on the word *πικρός*, which he translates 'bitter', while all the Homeric lexis which I have consulted render it 'sharp'. As to the taboo of women in the Iliad, and the epithet *κάρη κομόνυρες* as signifying that the Achaean warriors were "votaries" who must abstain from love, we have only, with Andrew Lang, to read the poem. And compare Mr. Sheppard in *THE CLASSICAL REVIEW* 26. 261. The whole theory has in fact no foundation. The instances are all either absurd or forced, and no one can have any regard to it who is not prepared to ascribe evidential value to Professor Murray's assertion that there *has* been expurgation or to Mr. Thomson's "feelings" and "impressions". The former, in the second edition of his *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, has sought support for his hypothesis in the flat and unprofitable atheteses made by the Alexandrians on account of *τὸ ἀνγενές*. "The process of expurgation was *still* active", he says, though there is not a sign anywhere that these critics believed themselves to be continuing an ancient system of purification. These excisions of theirs have mostly been laughed at by modern authorities, and we are never likely to waste more on them than Cobet's last word, "in Ptolemaei regia etiam fastidiosius foeminarum auribus erat consulendum". That a certain spirit in early Greece developed a like squeamishness is a mere resource of despair, and I think it has been shown above that the exposition of that spirit's working, so far as it is based on the Homeric text, is a mere darkening of the issue by discussions without knowledge.

ST. ANDREW'S, Scotland.

A. SHEWAN.

Latin Drill and Composition. By Ernest D. Daniels. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co. (1913). Pp. 125. 40 cents.

A most interesting little newcomer has made its appearance in our Latin book family—one destined, it would seem, to find a warm spot in the hearts of its future acquaintances. So accustomed are we to drill in Latin composition that it may not be until we open Mr. Daniels's book that we realize we have in it something that Caesar teachers have long been groping for in the dark. For as we flip over the systematically arranged pages, each with its concise nine sections, and inspect the material in them, we find that we have not only a composition, but a book outlining detailed preparation for the Caesar lesson. With this in hand, a pupil might come to class without that feeling of sickly dread for fear some monster of syntax should suddenly loom up in the darkness and cause his utter downfall. Says Mr. Daniels in his Introduction:

This book is prepared on the theory that the essential of first importance for the student of Latin is a ready and perfect mastery of the forms; that the next in importance, if one may analyze the elements so defi-

nately, is a thorough mastery of a well-selected vocabulary, the larger the better; and that the third element to be stressed is the simpler and more common principles of syntax. When these essentials are thoroughly mastered, composition is both easy and attractive, and Latin then becomes a fruitful and inspiring study.

Each exercise, to accompany the text read, with its five sections on forms and meanings, three on syntax and composition, and one on antiquities, etymology, idioms, etc., is arranged clearly and concisely. An instance, taken at random, is Exercise VII. Section 8 leaves a space for the teacher to supply the Grammar reference if he wishes.

VII.—GALLIC WAR, I, V, 1-4 (79-92)

1. Principal Parts and Meaning: *constituo, facio, conor, exeo, arbitror, incendo, porto, uro, persuadeo, utor*.
2. Infinitives and Participles in the Active Voice with Meanings: *facio, exeo, persuadeo, uro, proficiscor*.
3. Synopsis: third person singular, *utor*; third person plural, in the first periphrastic, *arbitror*. Conjugate the indicative of the first periphrastic of *exeo*, by terminations.
4. Decline in the Plural: *haec mors, latior finis, ea res, aedificium privatum*.
5. Decline in the Datives with Meanings: *quae domus, unus mensis, idem consilium, spes nobilior*.
6. Describe the cohorts, maniples, and centuries of the Roman army.
7. Construction: *finibus, exeant, esse, frumentum, domum, paratiores, essent, mensium, domo, eodem, consilio*.
8. Ablative of Cause,
9. Translate: 1. Because of his death, the Helvetians attempt to do that which they have decided. 2. Each one, because of that speech, carries ground meal from home. 3. On account of this plan, they set out; will set; have set out. 4. Because of the peace established with the Germans, they inhabit the fields which are across the Rhine.

Such definite requirements for preparation as this, with its drill on forms, its vocabulary and syntax based largely on the Lodge and Byrne lists, and the sentences for Latin writing cleverly ringing such changes on the text that the pupil will be obliged to think, should produce in our Caesar classes better results than we now have. At first the amount of work to be prepared might seem too great, but once in line the pupils would find the time required appreciably lessened, and a conscientious pupil might even think a little extra time spent on *definite* preparation preferable to wallowing in the Slough of Despond as his predecessors have done. Mr. Daniels says that, in a large class which used the material in mimeographed form, every pupil obtained promotion. The following is his suggestion for handling the exercises:

These exercises lend themselves to manifold uses: for home study in the beginning, for blank book exercises, but later, for classroom use only. Their most expeditious use may be systematized as follows: have a definite portion of blackboard for each exercise. The syntax and prose composition should be assigned to

¹No attempt is made here to reproduce the variety of type-forms used in Mr. Daniels's book, or the vowel markings.